

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite that the fluorine-containing polymer comprises a perfluoropolymer. Claim 3 has been amended to recite that the fluorine-containing polymer comprises tetrafluoroethylene/hexafluoropropylene copolymer (FEP) and/or tetrafluoroethylene/perfluoro (alkyl vinyl ether) copolymer (PFA). Support is found, for example, at page 6, lines 16-18 of the specification.

New claim 12 finds support, for example, at page 17, lines 10-13 of the specification.

Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Review and reconsideration on the merits are requested.

Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent 6,380,313 to Dillon. Dillon et al was cited as discloses a resin composition prepared by formulating a thermoplastic polymer with a fluoropolymer, and as exemplifying resin compositions comprising a polyolefin with 0.075 or 0.08% by weight of fluoropolymers containing tetrafluoroethylene units and other perfluoro monomers.

Applicants traverse, and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

The resin composition of amended claim 1 is prepared by formulating an engineering plastic with a perfluoropolymer in a specific mass ratio. The polyolefin resin of Dillon et al is not an engineering plastic. See page 5, lines 2-5 of the specification, "It is therefore an object of the present invention to provide a resin composition which, in the molding of meltable

engineering plastics, as distinguished from the hardly melt-moldable resins or polyolefin resins treated in the above prior art patent publications,...”.

On the other hand, Dillon et al does not disclose any specific combination of the engineering plastic as claimed in amended claim 1 and a perfluoropolymer. Referring to Dillon et al, Example 6 employs “10 wt% the modified fluoroelastomer (68 mole% TFE/32 mole% perfluoromethyl vinyl ether),” but this example also employs “the unmodified fluoropolymer of Example C2”, i.e., a tetrafluoroethylene (85 wt%)/propylene (15 wt%) copolymer, which is not a perfluoropolymer and is used in a predominant quantity (90 wt%) in “a fluoropolymer” consisting of a processing additive composition of Dillon et al.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the resin composition of amended claim 1 differs from the polymer processing additive composition of Dillon et al, and that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Dillon et al.

In response to the underlying rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Dillon et al does not teach or suggest any specific combination of an engineering plastic and a perfluoropolymer as recited in amended claim 1. Furthermore, Dillon et al did not recognize the advantages of the claimed resin composition prepared by formulating an engineering plastic with a perfluoropolymer, namely, improved molding processability in consideration of extrusion pressure, extrusion torque and the like. See page 5, lines 5-8 of the specification. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that there is no motivation to one of ordinary skill to modify Dillon et al to arrive at the claimed resin composition.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/989,160

Claims 2-4, 7 and 8 include all the limitations of amended claim 1, and therefore are patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over Dillon et al.

As recited in new claim 12, the resin composition comprises PTFE, FEP and/or PFA with nylon 66, PTFE, FEP and/or PFA with nylon 46, or PTFE, FEP and/or PFA with PEEK, which specific combinations are not taught or suggested by Dillon et al.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillon et al.

Applicants rely on the response above with respect to the rejection of claims 1-4, 7 and 8 over Dillon et al. Claims 5 and 6 conclude the limitations of amended claim 1, and are therefore patentable over Dillon et al for the same reasons as claim 1.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is respectfully requested.

In response to the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to hold this rejection in abeyance until Appln. 10/380,830 is allowed.

Furthermore, because non-elected method claims 9-11 include all of the limitations of product claim 1, Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of the withdrawn method claims if claim 1 is found to be allowable.

Withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of claims 1-12 is earnestly solicited.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/989,160

In the event that the Examiner believes that it may be helpful to advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number indicated below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Abraham J. Rosner
Registration No. 33,276

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 3, 2004